

**Department of Early Learning
Licensed Child Care Information System (LCCIS) Provider Forum
March 15, 2008**

**Key Themes Identified in Review of LCCIS Provider Forum
Compliance Example Worksheets**

Introduction

More than 130 participants representing various organizations took part in a Department of Early Learning (DEL) provider forum on March 15, 2008. The forum took place by videoconference to nine different Washington sites: Everett, Olympia, Pasco, Renton, Spokane, Tacoma, Vancouver, Wenatchee, and Yakima. Those represented were family child care and child care center providers, Service Employees International Union (SEIU) members, parents, and DEL staff.

The participants were charged with examining complaint examples that existed on the Licensed Child Care Information System (LCCIS) website. Participants were asked to come to a consensus about possible new examples or changes to existing language, and then recommend examples that are representative of actual complaints within the provider community.

DEL was able to determine new recommendations based on the LCCIS Compliance Example Worksheet, which contained the number of participants who supported specific examples as well as provider comments about new and existing examples.

DEL recognizes how important it is to work with providers and community members to create solutions to child care challenges. One of DEL's top priorities is to provide parents and providers the most accurate available information regarding child care. The LCCIS provider forum was an opportunity for DEL, providers and community members to work together toward solutions, and come to agreement on the recommendations for examples to post on the LCCIS site.

Limitations

The LCCIS provider forum yielded a comprehensive evaluation by participants of examples that were posted on the site at that time. The forum was held in response to concerns that the currently posted examples on the LCCIS website are not representative of providers around the state. Within the available time (4 hours) on March 15, the forums were able to provide DEL with valuable information regarding potential improvements DEL could make to LCCIS and the examples used.

Except for the Renton and Wenatchee sites, which divided themselves into groups by facility type and primary language spoken, participants did not separate themselves into groups by family home or center providers. This combined facility approach limited the access to specific information about each specific provider type. In future forums it will be important to specifically capture the comments and suggestions according to provider type, as well as clearly delineate provider type during the sign-in process.

In addition, it will be important to have participants register early enough for DEL to make arrangements for those needing language translation assistance. However, we are grateful to the providers who voluntarily translated for their colleagues.

Participants

A total of 132 participants signed the sign-in sheet. Other providers and community members participated in the forum, but chose not to sign the sign-in sheet.

Geographic areas

Geographic areas represented at the forum included: Everett, Olympia, Pasco, Renton, Spokane, Tacoma, Vancouver, Wenatchee, and Yakima. Bremerton was set up as a potential site; however no participants registered at this site.

Participants			
Site Group Facility name and location	Groups	Subgroups	Number of Participants
ESD 101, Spokane	Spokane 1	Family Home Providers	19
	Spokane 2	Center Providers	
	Came to a consensus as a group		
ESD 112, Vancouver	Vancouver	Mixed Family Home and Center Providers	22
	Came to a consensus as a group		
ESD 113, Olympia	Olympia	Family Home Providers	8
	Came to a consensus as a group		
ESD 114, Bremerton	None in attendance		0
ESD 121, Renton	Renton 1	Family Home Providers	37
	Renton 2	Family Home Providers	
	Renton 3	Center Providers and Community Members	
	Renton 4	Family Home Providers	
	Renton 5	Family Home Providers	
	Renton 6	Family Home Providers	
ESD 123, Pasco	Pasco	Mixed Family Home and Center Providers	23
	Came to a consensus as a group		
ESD 171, Wenatchee	Wenatchee 1	Family Home Providers	3
	Wenatchee 2	Center Providers	
	Came to a consensus as one group with the exception of one example in one category		
ESD 105, Yakima	Yakima	Providers	4
	Came to a consensus as a group		
Everett Community College, Everett	Everett	Providers	11
	Came to a consensus as a group		
Bates Technical College, Tacoma	Tacoma	Providers	5
	Came to a consensus as a group		
Total participants			132
The number of participants is based on each site's sign-in sheet. It does not delineate each participant's role, such as Family Home or Center Provider.			

Methodology

The following are the complaint categories that were listed on the LCCIS site and were discussed at the provider forum:

- Facility Environment
- Health/Sanitation
- Discipline
- Overcapacity
- Staff Qualifications
- Supervision
- Nurture/Care
- Character
- Failure to Report
- Reports/Record Keeping

Each of these complaint categories had three example complaints, for a total of 30 example complaints.

At each site, individuals reviewed the examples from each category, and made individual choices about their recommendations, which included:

- Example chosen as is. Accepted as originally written.
- Example chosen, with edits. With editing or rewording, example accepted.
- New written examples.

All comments were captured on the Compliance Example Worksheet. Participants at each site were given the existing examples and asked to evaluate each example, from each category. They were asked to try to come to consensus on each of the examples selected by the group.

Local site facilitators from DEL built the consensus across groups or subgroups by having a category discussion. Participant representation was not documented at each site; however participants at each site included Family Home Providers, Center Providers and others. The facilitator noted the local site's top three recommendations per category.

Each site's recommendations were then reviewed to the entire statewide group. Common recommendations, with suggested edits, were gathered based on the number of occurrences and common edit themes. The final recommendations were based on the total of each site's data and suggested edits or new examples. Across the state, for each category and each example, the family home and center populations did not significantly differ in their suggestions. Seven out of the nine participating sites followed the outlined process for the forum. Two sites did not, however. Pasco and Tacoma site participants chose to make one common recommendation for each category and example (see Main Findings under the sites for details).

Two sites were unable to report out to the larger statewide collection of groups due to the videoconferencing system shutting down during the last 30 minutes of the forum. However, recommendations and totals from these two sites were considered equally along with all other sites around the state.

Main findings (presented below) are represented as a compilation of each site rather than individual participants. In some cases, sites would select an example “as is.” If the site reached consensus to keep the example as is, the result presented during the state report-out would be one of consensus, or one recommendation toward the total.

Main Findings

The following represent the main findings from the seven sites who built consensus around each of the complaint examples. These sites included: Everett, Olympia, Renton, Spokane, Vancouver, Wenatchee and Yakima.

Category: **Facility Environment Recommendations**

1. Medication, chemicals, cleaning supplies and/or other dangerous items left within reach of children
2. Provider without developmentally appropriate equipment and materials accessible to the children in care
3. Play equipment did not meet fall zone or ground cover requirements

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of six sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of four sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of five sites.

Category: **Health/Sanitation**

1. Facility was dirty
2. Septic system failure
3. Hand washing practice not followed

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of four sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of four sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of six sites.

Category: **Discipline**

1. Provider struck and/or threatened to strike children, or subjected children to verbal or emotional abuse
2. Provider used inappropriate discipline on a child
3. Caregiver bit child after child bit another child

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of four sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of seven sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.

Category: **Overcapacity**

1. Provider is caring for more children than they are licensed for
2. Children moved to unlicensed space to avoid being overcapacity
3. 14 children are cared for in a facility licensed for 12 children

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation numbers 1, 2, and 3 are reflective of the common themes of seven sites. This category was unique in that there were several edits and new suggestions, all reflecting the top three common themes.

Category: **Staff Qualifications**

1. Provider left children alone with unqualified person
2. Staff working without background check, tuberculosis test, resume, CPR/First Aid and/or HIV training
3. Staff does not have required training for their specific position

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of seven sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of six sites.

Category: **Supervision**

1. Child is not in visual or auditory range
2. Child left licensed area unnoticed by staff
3. Provider is not on the same level of the home as the children, leaving the children unsupervised

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of six sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of six sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.

Category: **Nurture/Care**

1. Provider propped infant's bottle instead of holding infant
2. Provider told child care children they were to stay in a room and watch television
3. Provider or staff did not interact with the children in a nurturing, respectful, supportive or responsive way

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of seven sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of two sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.

Category: **Character**

1. Provider lied and instructed staff to lie to licensor/parent
2. Provider submitted forged or inaccurate documentation to the Department
3. Provider allowed a known registered sex offender on child care premises

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of five sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of five sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.

Category: **Failure to report**

1. Child disclosed abuse to provider who did not report the incident in a timely manner
2. Provider did not report a situation where a child acted out sexually with another child
3. A child was injured; staff did not report it to parents, director or licensor

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of four sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of four sites.

Category: **Reports/Record keeping**

1. Failed to complete an incident report for a child's injury
2. Staff records are incomplete
3. Staff gave medication to a child three different times and in the wrong dosage. No documentation existed that the staff administered the wrong dosage

In this category, the recommendations capture the top three common themes statewide, in no particular order.

Recommendation number 1 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.
Recommendation number 2 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.
Recommendation number 3 is reflective of the common theme of three sites.

Two sites

Pasco and Tacoma elected to select one set of recommendations for each complaint category. These recommendations included:

1. A provider explanation and concurrent explanation for each valid complaint
2. Posting of the compliance agreement with a short description of the rule violation Washington Administrative Code (WAC).

3. "Example" text box would list the actual WAC instead of examples (educate public to view compliance agreements)

Summary

In general, providers from both family homes and centers were able to achieve consensus around the state. Complaint category examples were agreed upon and are now posted on the DEL LCCIS website. In many instances, providers chose examples as is or with edits, which made the examples more general and non-specific.

Implications

The example worksheets delineated common themes from both family home and center providers. Providers who participated in the example worksheet exercises demonstrated a desire to have posted examples be representative around the state. This was clear in the non-case-specific examples suggested and recommended by the providers.

Parking Lot Issues

During the provider forum many different parking lot issues were identified. DEL is currently evaluating each of the parking lot issues and developing strategies around each thematic area. Parking lot issues, by theme, include:

- **LCCIS Website**
 - Examples
 - Don't post examples on the website at all
 - Provide specifics of incident written by the providers
 - Inconclusive
 - Don't post inconclusive findings on the LCCIS website
 - Focus on positive as well
 - Highlight positive aspects of the providers
 - Definitions
 - WAC not written clearly
 - Why have examples if we have WAC
 - Compliance Agreements
 - Post agreements instead of examples
 - Allow space on the agreement form for providers comments
 - Licensing
 - Date posted on LCCIS indicating how long the facility has been licensed is incorrect, misleading to viewers
- **LCCIS Telephone Line**
 - Give accurate information out
 - Inconclusive listed on web, but specifics are not shared on the line
- **LCCIS Process**
 - Is there a timeframe for a valid complaint to "drop off" provider's information
 - Differences between offices – posting, etc.
- **Education**
 - Training in WAC as it pertains to family child care licensing
 - Providers – STARS credits for attending forum

Forum Evaluations

A standard evaluation was made available at each site. Both narrative comments and numeric evaluation scores were gathered by this tool. A summary of evaluation results is shown in the table below:

Question 1: Of the following choices, please rank in order from 1-6, what you liked most about this provider forum. 1 being the item you liked the most and 6 being the item, if any, you liked least.						
Average per category						
Site	Handout	Opportunity for input	The way the forum was run	Your facilitator or state facilitator	Video Conference format	Other
Everett	3.4	2.18	3.8	3	4	None
Olympia	3.5	1.86	3	2.3	3	None
Pasco	3	3	4	2	3	6
Renton	2.4	2.9	2.3	1.4	3.5	1.4
Spokane	2.3	3.8	4.1	2.5	3	5.6
Tacoma	3	2	4.3	1.3	4.6	None
Vancouver	2.9	1.7	4	3.7	3	6
Wenatchee	3.5	2	4	1.3	4	None
Yakima	4	1	2	3	3	6

Statewide data reflecting what was most liked by participants:

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1. Opportunity for input | 2.27 |
| 2. Your Facilitator or State Facilitator | 2.28 |
| 3. Handouts | 3.11 |
| 4. Video Conference Format | 3.45 |
| 5. The way the forum was run | 3.50 |
| 6. Other | 5.0 |

Average scores are on a scale from 1 to 6, where “1” = an item you like the most; and “6” = an item you liked least.

Themes per category, identified in the review of the evaluations, include:

Handouts:

- Make packets for participants, in order
- Number handouts
- Good, informational handouts

Opportunity for input:

- Good
- Appreciative
- Not enough time

The way the forum was run:

- Well organized
- Good sharing and rules for procedure were well stated
- Need to stick to the agenda

Your facilitator or state facilitator:

- Good
- Listened
- Informational

Video Conference Format:

- Great
- More time
- Effective

Other:

- Translators
- Inconclusive taken off website
- More time